



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It might be suggested that this question would not come up for consideration if Hebrew were recognized as it should be in our colleges, so that men might enter the seminary prepared to study the Old Testament as they do the New. But the responsibility rests for the present upon the seminaries, and until the better time when the Semitic languages find a place in the curricula of all good colleges, they must continue to carry the responsibility; and the higher they keep their standard, the more urgently they demand a knowledge of Hebrew, the sooner will the need be supplied.

Shall the Revision be Revised?—This question has been asked in all soberness; but is it really worthy of consideration? Would any thing be gained by a second revision? Would a second revision be more likely either to satisfy the popular mind, or to command the respect of scholars?

The most difficult item in the whole problem of Bible-Revision is the fact that the desire, and we may perhaps add, the whims, of two entirely distinct and widely separated classes of people must be satisfied. It will never be possible for any man, or set of men, to produce a revision of the Holy Scriptures which will be entirely acceptable even to a majority of either of these classes. For scholars, nothing short of a new translation will be at all satisfactory; for the average Bible-reader, even the changes which a revision introduces are distasteful. The revision of the Revision means still further changes. When these are made, the scholar will still remain unsatisfied; while, on the other hand, every additional change will make the general adoption of the Revision more difficult.

We believe that further revision will be fruitless. Let the time and money which would thus be spent be given to work on the Old Testament *text*; and when the necessary work has been done in this line, let us have a new translation. For the present, and for the next half century, the recent Revision, notwithstanding its defects and shortcomings, must suffice.

The Revision, Considered Theologically.—Two charges have been made against the theological character of the new Revision. It is claimed, on the one hand, that many additional changes would have been made, but for the theological prejudices of the majority of the revisers; and on the other hand, that the rationalistic tendency of a large minority of the revisers is clearly seen in the character of the marginal readings which have been introduced in such number.

The most interesting of all the texts in the Old Testament are those which are commonly believed to refer directly or indirectly to the Messiah. Now in the case of many of these texts there has been handed down a traditional interpretation with which the Messianic teaching of the Old Testament, as it lies in the minds of many scholars, is indissolubly connected. Of these passages, Gen. XLIX., 10 *Until Shiloh come*, Isa. VII., 14 *A virgin shall conceive and bear a son*, Ps. XXII., 16 *They pierced my hands and my feet*, may be taken as specimens. The old interpretation seems to be given up, if the marginal translation is adopted, *Till he come to Shiloh, A maiden is with child and beareth, They bound, or like a lion, my hands and my feet*.

Those, therefore, who maintained the rendering as given in the text are charged with being influenced by traditional prejudices; while those who stood for the marginal rendering are termed rationalistic.

But what, after all, is the *translator's* work? Is he to translate in accordance with some preconceived idea, adjusting lexicon and grammar to his theological views? Or is he to cast aside every thing of the nature of prejudice, and to decide for that rendering which a correct text, properly studied by the aid of grammar and lexicon, will furnish him?

It is, to be sure, impossible to rid oneself entirely of preconceived notions. Every man has a tendency, one way or the other, and he will unconsciously be influenced more or less by this tendency. But if it can be shown that either of these charges is true, or that both are true, a most telling blow has been struck against the probability of the general adoption of the Revision. Translation is one thing, interpretation is quite another.